

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/960,708	09/19/2001	Gerald R. Crabtree	STAN201	4284
24353	7590 08/19/2004		EXAMINER	
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP			MCGARRY, SEAN	
SUITE 200	200 MIDDLEFIELD RD SUITE 200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			1635	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/960,708	CRABTREE ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sean R McGarry	1635
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims well)		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 8-11,15-18, and 30-42.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b)☐ disapproved by th	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<del>.</del>
10.  Other:		
		5
		Sean R McGarry Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1635

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/960,708

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed claim amendments would require a new search and consideration since the amendments change, for example, the action from modulation to inhibition and specifically to a host having a condition associated with unwanted angiogenesis. A new search would be required for these new and limitations, for example.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are based on the proposed amendment and since the amendment has not been entered, the arguments are moot..